



City of Albuquerque
Planning Department
Landmarks Commission
P.O. Box 1293
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103

Date: September 8, 2021

OFFICIAL NOTIFICATION OF DECISION

Project 2021-005879
SI-2021-01277
Application for Certificate of
Appropriateness

3222 Central LLC, c/o Adam Silverman, requests approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alterations at 3222 Central Avenue SE, described as Lots 12-14, M & K Replat of Tract A, Block 41, University Heights Addition (K-16).

On September 8, 2021 the Landmarks Commission voted for Approval of **Project 2021-005879, SI-2021-01277** based on the following Findings.

FINDINGS:

1. The application is a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness for the property described as Lots 12-14, M & K Replat of Tract A, Block 41, University Heights Addition, located at 3222 Central Avenue SE and zoned MX-M.
2. The subject property is approximately 0.56 acres and contains the historic Jones Motor Company Building. It is listed on the National Register of Historic Properties, the New Mexico State Register of Cultural Properties, and is a City of Albuquerque Landmark.
3. The proposal is for alterations to five bay doors in the garage building.
4. Section 14-16-3-5(D) of the Integrated Development Ordinance states that on a City Landmark, the appearance of any structure, including but not limited to interior and exterior elements, landscaping, and signs, shall not be altered; new structures shall not be constructed; and existing structures shall not be demolished until a Certificate of Appropriateness is approved pursuant to Subsection 14-16-6-5(B) (Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Minor) or Subsection 14-16-6-6(D) (Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major).

5. Subsection 14-16-6-6(D) of the Integrated Development Ordinance specifies that an application for a Certificate of Appropriateness – Major shall be approved if it complies with several specified criteria. The IDO Section 14-16-6-6(D)(3)(a) states that a Certificate of Appropriateness shall be approved if *“The change is consistent with the designation ordinance and specific development guidelines for the landmark or the specific HPO zone where the property is located”*.

The Design Guidelines for the Jones Motor Company state that the multi-service building behind the main building and the space between the two shall be preserved as definers of its historic character.

The position, number, size and arrangement of the historic door openings will be maintained. In the spirit similar to the original glazing in the garage doors, the applicant is proposing that the original garage door materiality and color act as a frame around the roll up door (aluminum) and counter (stainless steel). These materials have been chosen for exterior weather resistance and security while the following the historic replacement guidelines.

6. The IDO Section 14-16-6-6(D)(3)(b) states that the architectural character, historical value, or archaeological value of the structure or site itself or of any HPO zone in which it is located will not be significantly impaired or diminished.

The proposal will cause no harm to site. Being an activity hub will bring back some of the original traveling visitor nature of the site.

7. The IDO Section 14-16-6-6(D)(3)(c) states that the change qualifies as a "certified rehabilitation" pursuant to the Tax Reform Act of 1976, if applicable.

Not applicable.

8. The IDO Section 14-16-6-6(D)(3)(d) states that the structure or site's distinguished original qualities or character will not be altered, where “original” means both those included at the time of initial construction and those developed over the history of the structure.

The proposal will cause no harm to the original, distinguished qualities of the contributing building or site.

9. The IDO Section 14-16-6-6(D)(3)(e) states deteriorated architectural features shall be repaired rather than replaced, to the maximum extent practicable. If replacement is necessary, the new material shall match the original as closely as possible in like material and design.

The exterior changes are unavoidable in making the use not only possible, but sustainable in the long-term. The applicant is proposing to improve five (5) of the nine (9) existing bay door openings. The changes include: maintaining the position, number, size, and

arrangement of the historic bay openings; preserve 4 out of 5 historic bay doors in their current location. Three of the doors will be fixed in place and modified from the inside only using techniques and materials that are intended to render improvements reversible in the future; for the walk door and service window bay, materials will be reused from the original door for the finish of solid wall area on the exterior. A new door will be installed that provides matching surface relief and glazing locations using the pattern dimensions of the original garage door design; on the top row of the “door” pattern, add a removable layer of interior glazing to the interior faces of each bay door for added security and thermal resistance. On the next row down, add translucent glazing in the same way for the same purposes with enhanced security since the height is at the eye level; an awning over the east door and walk-up window is proposed as a simple fabric covering over a simple metal frame. A practical awning is being proposed that will remain consistent with the original garage function. The Landmarks Commission is basing their Findings on the second set of plans that were reviewed at the September 8, 2021 Hearing.

10. The IDO Section 6-6(D)(3)(f) Additions to existing structures and new construction may be of contemporary design if such design is compatible with its landmark status (if any) or the HPO zone in which it is to be located.

Not applicable.

13. The IDO Section 6-6(D)(3)(g) If the application is for a Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major for demolition of a landmark or a contributing structure in an HPO zone, demolition shall only be allowed if it is determined that the property is incapable of producing a reasonable economic return as presently controlled and that no means of preserving the structure has been found. In making a determination regarding reasonable economic return, the LC or City Council may consider the estimated market value of the building, land, and any proposed replacement structures; financial details of the property, including but not limited to income and expense statements, current mortgage balances, and appraisals; the length of time that the property has been on the market for sale or lease; potential return based on projected future market conditions; the building’s structural condition; and other items determined to be relevant to the application.

Not applicable. The application is not for a Historic Certificate of Appropriateness – Major for demolition.

RECOMMENDATION

Case SI-2021-01277/Project #2021-005879 - September 8, 2021

APPROVAL of a Certificate of Appropriateness for Alterations for the property described as Lots 12-14, M & K Replat of Tract A, Block 41, University Heights Addition, located at 3222 Central

Avenue SE and zoned MX-M, based on the above 13 Findings and subject to the following conditions.

Recommended Conditions of Approval for Case #SI-2021-01277/Project #2021-005879

1. Applicant is responsible to acquire, and approval is contingent upon, all applicable permits and related approvals.

APPEAL: IF YOU WISH TO APPEAL A **FINAL DECISION** YOU MUST DO SO IN THE MANNER DESCRIBED BELOW. A NON-REFUNDABLE FILING FEE WILL BE CALCULATED AT THE LAND DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION COUNTER AND IS REQUIRED AT THE TIME THE APPEAL IS FILED.

The applicant or any person aggrieved by decision of city staff may appeal the decision of the city staff designated by the Mayor relative to a Certificate of Appropriateness to the Commission. The applicant or any person aggrieved by decision of the Commission (LC) may appeal the decision to the City Council. Any city staff or Commission decision is final unless appeal is initiated by application to the city within 15 days of the decision. The date the determination is not included in the 15-day period for filing an appeal, and if the 15th day falls on a Saturday, Sunday or holiday as listed in §3-1-12, the next working day is considered as the deadline for filing the appeal. A building permit dependent on a case shall not be issued and a proposed project not requiring a building permit shall not be initiated until an appeal is decided or the time for filing the appeal has expired without an appeal being filed.

The City Council, after consideration of the appeal record, may decline to hear an appeal if it finds that all city plans, policies and ordinances have been properly followed. If it decides that there is substantial question that all City plans, policies and ordinances have not been properly followed or are inadequate, it shall hear the appeal.

ALL CASES THAT RECEIVED APPROVAL ON SEPTEMBER 8, 2021 WILL BE MAILED A CERTIFICATE OF APPROPRIATENESS, AFTER THE 15-DAY APPEAL PERIOD HAS EXPIRED ON **SEPTEMBER 23, 2021**.

Silvia Bolivar

Silvia Bolivar, PLA, ASLA
Historic Preservation Planner
Urban Design and Development Division